



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,791	07/10/2001	Soo Sung Lee	10484-027US (D/LSS-210171)	9344
570	7590	01/19/2005	EXAMINER	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P. ONE COMMERCE SQUARE 2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-7013			MCFADDEN, SUSAN IRIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2655	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/901,791	LEE, SOO SUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Susan McFadden	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-8,22,23,25-29,46-51,53-55, and 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holzrichter et al. (5729694).

In regard to claim 1, Holzrichter et al. show in Fig. 8, a language independent voice communication system that comprise a translation unit for translating a one language input speech to one or more corresponding other language speeches (Abstract, speech translation, Figs. 8, item 75).

In regard to claims 2,5, and 24, Holzrichter et al further shows in Fig. 8, a speech recognizer for recognizing the input speech (item 77); at least one translation module electrically connected to the speech recognizer for translating the recognized first language input speech to the corresponding other language speech (item 75); and output outputting the translated speeches (item 76, speech synthesizer which inherently includes a speaker).

In regard to claim 3, Holzrichter et al further shows that the system contains an A/D converter for converting analog into digital speech signals (Fig. 2, item 2, col. 14, ln 20-23).

In regard to claims 4 and 7, Holzrichter et al further shows that the system inherently contains first and second language reference databases (claim 13) and a language translator (Fig. 8, item 75) for storing language samples.

In regard to claims 8,22,23,46,47,54,55, and 68-69, Holzrichter et al further shows there can be a table inherently containing language codes for mapping first language samples to first language phrases (col. 63, ln 55-60) in parallel.

In regard to claims 25,26,27,28,29,48,49,50,51, and 53, Holzrichter et al shows that the system above can be contained in a telephone (Paragraph 59).

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by D'hoore (6085160), cited by Applicant.

In regard to claim 1, D'hoore shows a language independent voice communication system that comprise a translation unit for translating a one language input speech to one or more corresponding other language speeches (Abstract, Figs. 1,3).

In regard to claim 2, D'hoore further shows in Fig. 4, a speech recognizer for recognizing the input speech (item 48); at least one translation module electrically connected to the speech recognizer for translating the recognized first language input speech to the corresponding other language speech (items 44,45); and outputting the translated speeches (identified speech).

Art Unit: 2655

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6,30, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holzrichter (cited above).

In regard to claim 6, Holzrichter et al shows that the system above which inherently contains a D/A converter. Holzrichter do not specifically show that the output means comprises a modulator and an antenna for transmitting the modulated output speech signal. The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that mobile phones commonly contain these features. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to add these features because they provide the output of the system with more range.

In regard to claims 30 and 52, Holzrichter et al shows that the system above but does not specifically show that the output means connected to a handset connection pod of the main body of the telephone set such that the second language speech signal is transmitted to the counterpart translation unit via a public switched telephone network (PSTN). The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that mobile phones commonly contain these features. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to add these features because they provide the output of the system with more range.

6. Claims 9-21,32-45,56-59, and 60-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holzrichter in view of D'hoore (both cited above).

In regard to claims 9-12,32,33,34,35,36,37, and 56-59, Holzrichter et al show the system above which outputs first and second digital speech signals and contains mapping features. Holzrichter do not specifically show that the various language mapping tables. D'hoore shows the various mapping tables in Figure 3. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to add these features because they add more versatility to the system.

In regard to claims 13-20, 38-44, and 60-66, Holzrichter et al show the system above but do not specifically show that the translation controller calculates a percentage of an identical proportion and extracts candidates based on this value and predetermined threshold values and various other functions. The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to program language translators so they output what is desired. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to add these features because they provide the output of the system with more versatility.

In regard to claims 21,45, and 67, Holzrichter et al show the system above but do not specifically show that the translation module is a removable ROM Pack. The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to create a removable module for a translation system. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to add this feature because it makes the components of the system with more versatile.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan McFadden whose telephone number is 703-308-6693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 703-305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Susan McFadden  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2655

January 12, 2005